



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/702,551	11/07/2003	Hong Su Lee	2658-0314P	8245
2292	7590	01/25/2006	EXAMINER	
BIRCH STEWART KOLASCH & BIRCH PO BOX 747 FALLS CHURCH, VA 22040-0747			VARGOT, MATHIEU D	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		1732		

DATE MAILED: 01/25/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/702,551	LEE ET AL.	
	Examiner Mathieu D. Vargot	Art Unit 1732	

Am
- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address -
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 November 2005.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-15 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-15 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
 6) Other: _____.

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Higuchi et al in view of the admitted prior art (APA) of instant Figure 3.

Higuchi et al is applied for reasons of record, the primary reference failing to show that the stamper is fixed to a core material of the mold. However, the admitted prior art shows that the instant platen/core arrangement for forming light guides is well known in the art. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in this art to modify the mold and method of Higuchi et al by attaching the stamper and fixing member to a core material to allow more flexibility (ie, movable cores where the larger platen does not have to move) in the forming process. At column 7, lines 47-50, Higuchi et al teaches electroforming the mold from nickel.

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to the claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

In view of applicant's arguments concerning the core, which admittedly is lacking in Higuchi et al, a new rejection has been made using Higuchi et al in combination with what applicant admits is known in the art and depicted in instant Figure 3. Applicant's additional comments concerning patentability for the claims are not persuasive.

Certainly, Higuchi et al shows a fixing structure for fixing the stamper to base 1a of the mold. In that bolts are used to assist in the fixing, it is *prime facie* obvious that the bolts

would be passed directly into the stamper should that be desired. Is applicant suggesting that the claims would be patentable based on the instant bolting arrangement? It is notoriously well known in the art to fix items in place using bolts that pass through the item and the arrangement shown in Higuchi et al is more complicated than this. Does not applicant think that conventional methods and means to bolt items together would be known to those of ordinary skill in this art? If not, the skill level would not be very high indeed. Contrary to applicant's comments, such a feature simply cannot be patentable subject matter and applicant should be well aware of this. The thickness of the stamper would have been well within the skill level of the art. Certainly, applicant cannot believe the instant mold or process would be patentable based on this feature? Higuchi et al (col. 5, line 8) teaches that the light guide would have a thickness of from 1-8 mm. While figures cannot be relied upon to teach exact dimensions, the drawings of Higuchi et al show that the stamper (1b) is approximately as thick as the molded light guide. One of ordinary skill in the art would find the instant 6-12 mm thickness as obvious over this.

3. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mathieu D. Vargot whose telephone number is 571 272-1211. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri from 9 to 6.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Colaianni, can be reached on 571 272-1196. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

M. Vargot
January 20, 2006

M. Vargot
Mathieu D. Vargot
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1732

1/20/06